

**REMARKS:**

The preceding claim amendments and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action issued on October 3, 2007. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found, *inter alia*, at page 4, line 28 to page 4a, line 3 of the specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled, because they are moot in light of the amendments to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-7 and 10-19 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication 58115947 to Koichi et al. The rejection of claim 8 is moot as claim 8 has been cancelled. Claim 1, from which claims 2-7 and 10 depend, has been amended to recite that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Koichi does not disclose the use of a Fabry-Perot-laser as a main laser and a DFB or a DBR laser as an auxiliary laser. Rather, Koichi uses two lasers with coincidental spectra (see page 2), i.e. identical or very similar lasers.

Fabry-Perot lasers have the advantage that they can be fabricated very economically but they tend to generate a multimode output. The inventors, however, realized that despite that disadvantage a Fabry-Perot-laser can be used as main laser in a low jitter laser system if a (monomode) injection pulse generated by a DFB or DBR laser is fed into it. The injection pulse of the DFB or DBR laser excites a single associated mode in the Fabry-Perot main laser such that its output is monomode (see page 4a of the specification). The invention thus provides a cost saving laser system for generating low jitter pulses.

As mentioned above, Koichi discloses only identical or at least very similar main and auxiliary lasers. There is no suggestion or disclosure that for the generation of pulses with low jitter it is sufficient to use a cost-effective Fabry-Perot laser triggered by a DFB or a DBR laser.

With respect to claim 11, from which claims 12-19 depend, claim 11 has also been amended to recite that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable for at the least the reasons above.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 58115947 to Koichi et al in view of U.S. Patent 4,347,437 to Mourou.

With respect to claims 3, 4 and 6, these claims depend from claim 1, and as above, Koichi does not, at the least, disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Mourou fails to cure these deficiencies.

With respect to claims 13, 14 and 16, these claims depend from claim 11, and as above, Koichi does not, at the least, disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Mourou fails to cure these deficiencies.

Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 58115947 to Koichi et al in view of U.S. Patent 4,347,437 to Mourou, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,005,880 to Basting et al.

With respect to claim 5, claim 5 depends from claim 1, and as above, neither Koichi nor Mourou disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Basting fails to cure these deficiencies.

With respect to claim 15, claim 15 depends from claim 11, and as above, neither Koichi nor Mourou disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Basting fails to cure these deficiencies.

Claims 7 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 58115947 to Koichi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0103534 to Braiman et al.

With respect to claim 7, claim 7 depends from claim 1, and as above, Koichi does not, at the least, disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Braiman fails to cure these deficiencies.

With respect to claim 17, claim 17 depends from claim 11, and as above, Koichi does not, at the least, disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Braiman fails to cure these deficiencies.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 9 is moot as claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Publication 58115947 to Koichi et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication

2002/0015206 to Hakimi et al. Claim 10 depends from claim 1, and as above, Koichi does not, at the least, disclose or suggest that the main laser is a Fabry-Perot laser and the auxiliary laser is at least one of a DFB laser or a DBR laser. Hakimi fails to cure these deficiencies.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all outstanding rejections have been overcome, and the instant application is in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request early allowance of the instant application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fee for such an extension together with additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

Respectfully submitted,

By       /David Orange/  
David B. Orange  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 55,513  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK  
1425 K. Street, Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 783-6040